

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-10 and 12-22 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6 and 9 are amended, and Claims 19-22 are new. Support for the changes to the claims is found in the originally filed disclosure, including the drawings at least in Fig. 3, specifically steps SP7 and SP10-SP12. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 9-10 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. 2002/0197955 (Witkowski) in view of JP 2001-112071 (Sugiura), U.S. 5,046,007 (McCrery) and U.S. 4,714,925 (Bartlett); Claims 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Witkowski in view of Sugiura, McCrery, Bartlett and U.S. 2001/0028297 (Hara); Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Witkowski in view of Sugiura, McCrery, Bartlett and U.S. 2002/0184062 (Diaz); and Claims 16-17 were allowed.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 16-17. As to the other claims, amended Claim 4 recites:

A vehicle to download desired information from a prespecified information storage means, the vehicle comprising:

a key-less entry system to receive a remote control signal from an electronic key, the remote control signal including information identifying the vehicle;

communication means for receiving said remote control signal from said electronic key; and

control means for transferring desired data via said communication means, wherein said control means executes an operation for locking a door of the vehicle with said remote control signal from the electronic key received by said communication means, *initiates a transfer of said desired information from said prespecified information storage means to be received by said communication means in response to said door of the vehicle locking by said remote control signal*, said acquired desired information selected based on the information identifying the vehicle included with said remote control signal, and initiates a transfer of driving information, in response to said remote control signal triggering said transferring of said selected desired

information, via said communication means, to said prespecified information storage means.

[Emphasis added].

As emphasized above, Claim 4 requires an initialization of a transfer of desired information in response to a door of a vehicle locking by a remote control signal. Further, new Claim 20 requires the transfer of the desired information to be in response to a request to transfer the selected desired information within a predetermined amount of time of locking the door of the vehicle by the remote control signal. It is respectfully submitted the cited references are deficient in disclosing or reasonably suggesting either of these features.

Specifically, the Office Action relies on Sugiura to disclose the use of a keyless transmitter to send a door locking signal to a car, and initializing functions of a home server 23 when the signal is detected by the home server 23.¹ However, Sugiura does not consider whether the door to the car is actually locked by the door locking signal, and thus does not share the advantages of Claim 4.²

None of the other cited references disclose or reasonably suggest this feature. Therefore it is respectfully submitted Claim 4 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 20 further requires a request to be made within a predetermined amount of time of locking the car door by the door locking signal.³ The cited references are silent regarding this feature. Therefore it is respectfully submitted Claim 20 is further allowable over the cited references by virtue of this feature.

Although directed to different statutory classes and/or varying in scope, Claims 1, 6 and 9 recite features which are also allowable over the cited references for substantially the same reasons as discussed above regarding Claim 1. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted Claims 19 and 21-22 are also further allowable over the cited references for substantially the same reasons as discussed above regarding Claim 20.

¹ Office Action, page 3.

² See, e.g., page 14, lines 9-15.

³ See, e.g., page 14, lines 6 to page 15, line 9.


Consequently, in light of the above comments, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the examiner disagree, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss any remaining issues. Otherwise, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Marc A. Robinson
Registration No. 59,276